

XIX.—Notes on the Coleopterous Genera *Horia*, Fab., and *Cissites*, Latr., and a List of the described Species. By C. J. GAHAN, M.A.

THE two genera of Meloidæ that form the subject of these notes comprise altogether less than twenty known species, and the genera themselves are very easily to be distinguished from one another; yet the number of errors that have in one way or another come to be associated with them is truly astonishing. The chief of these errors have already been discovered and corrected by others, but, unfortunately, attention was called to them in such a way that they have been noticed either very inadequately or not at all in the 'Zoological Record'—an omission for which the Recorders are in no wise to blame. They have been brought to my own knowledge in an endeavour to determine the correct name to be given to a species in a collection from Ruwenzori Mountain on which I am now working, and will incidentally, perhaps, illustrate the difficulties with which a systematist has to contend if he wish to be accurate.

The species to which I have just referred obviously belonged to the genus generally recognized as *Cissites*, Latr.; but on reference to Kolbe's very valuable paper of 1897 on the Coleoptera of East Africa, I there found (1) that *Cissites*, Latr., was placed as a synonym of *Horia*, Fab., on the ground that the same species, viz. *Horia testacea*, Fab., was the type of both genera, and (2) that a new generic name (*Synhoria*) was proposed by Kolbe for the species (*cephalotes*, *maxillosa*, *maculata*, &c.) that had hitherto been regarded as constituting the genus *Horia*, Fab. This led me to further inquiry. I found Kolbe quite right in stating that *Horia testacea* was the type of the genus *Horia*, Fab.; but this also I found, that, contrary to the statement of Kolbe, which was probably borrowed from Lacordaire, and contrary also to a similar statement made and repeated by Latreille himself, *Horia testacea*, Fab., is not the type of *Cissites*, Latr. The type of this genus I found to be *Cissites maculata* (Swed.), the *Horia maculata* of Olivier and Fabricius, one of the species included by Kolbe in his genus *Synhoria*. It does not necessarily follow, however, that *Synhoria* should be treated as a synonym of *Cissites*. Kolbe specified no type for his genus; and if *cephalotes*, Oliv., the first species mentioned by him, be taken as the type, it will be shown that *Synhoria*, if not a distinct genus, is at least a very

distinct subgenus of *Cissites*, distinct both structurally and geographically.

So far the result of my investigation was to show that for over half a century the genera *Horia* and *Cissites* had been interchanged in our collections and entomological works. But a stranger discovery was to follow. I found that this remarkable error had already been discovered and published by Professor Beauregard in his admirable treatise on 'Les Insectes Vésicants,' dated 1890. In dealing with the matter the learned Professor himself fell into some trifling errors (one of a somewhat amusing character), and made also one very lamentable mistake—that of adopting knowingly in his own work the very errors to which he had called attention. From Latreille's *Hist. Nat.* 1804 he quotes the following passages to show what Latreille's original conceptions of the genera were:—"L'*Horie testacée* diffère des autres espèces par les proportions de la tête et du corselet qui sont plus étroits que les élytres, ce caractère m'a engagé à former parmi les Hories un nouveau genre celui des *Cissites*. Cette nouvelle coupe serait composée de l'*Horia maculata* d'Olivier et de son *Horia cephalotes*. L'*Horie testacée* serait le type du genre *Horia* On voit ainsi que les Hories à tête de la largeur du corselet ou plus large, mes *Cissites*. . . ."

"Il ressort de ces phrases que Latreille donnait le nom d'*Horia* aux espèces à tête plus large ou égale en largeur au corselet et celui de *Cissites* aux espèces à tête et corselet moins large que les élytres."

This exposition by M. Beauregard of Latreille's phrases is, of course, an absolute inversion of the facts, exactly what, a few lines further on, he charges Lacordaire with having made. "Lacordaire," he writes, "réprit pour son compte cette division en deux genres, mais par une singulière erreur, il intervertit les caractères et assigna le nom de *Horia* aux espèces à tête grande aussi large au moins que le prothorax et celui de *Cissites* aux espèces à tête médiocre plus étroite que le prothorax."

The charge made against Lacordaire is just, but there is this excuse for him: the same mistake was previously made by Castelnau, and, as I find, originated with Latreille himself, who in 1807, three years after the first publication of his genus, assigned the characters and species of his own genus *Cissites* to *Horia*, Fab., and *vice versa*. This mistake he repeated in 1829; but in a work which came between—the article "*Horia*" in the "nouvelle édit." of the '*Nouveau Dictionnaire*,' which is signed *O.* and *L.*—the genera are constituted as they originally were in the first edition, and,

further, *Horia maculata* is definitely stated there to be the type of the genus *Cissites*.

It is interesting to note that although Lacordaire, in his 'Genera,' and Gemminger and Harold, in their 'Catalogue,' wrongly construe the genera, the single reference in each case is to one of those works of Latreille in which the genera are correctly characterized.

But it is not alone in reference to the interpretation of the genera that mistakes have occurred. There is scarcely a single one of the older species, and not many, I fear, amongst those more recently described, with which some mistake is not associated.

To begin with: the *Horia testacea*, Fab., type of the genus *Horia*, is not the species Fabricius thought it was, viz. the *Lymexylon testaceum*, Fab., of an earlier work, and will therefore require a new name if one cannot be found for it amongst those since published, which is not improbable. It may possibly be the species described by Fairmaire as *Cissites debyi*; it was clearly, I think, the latter species that Aurivillius took to be *testacea*, Fab., and which he differentiated as such when describing his own species *africanus*. There is, however, another species equally as common as *debyi*, if not more common, in South India, and to this other species, regarded by some authors as the true *Horia testacea* of Fabricius, the characters given for *africanus* apply. In the uncertainty therefore as to what species the type of the genus *Horia* really is, we must continue to call that type *Horia testacea*, Fab. Fabricius specified no collection as containing his type specimens. *Cucujus clavipes*, Fab., given as a synonym by Fabricius, has nothing to do with it.

The type specimen (a female) of *Lymexylon testaceum*, Fab. (1781), is preserved in the Banksian cabinet of the British Museum. It belongs to the genus *Cissites*, Latr., and is without doubt an African species.

Horia cephalotes, Oliv., stated by its author to have come from S. America, and later placed by Fabricius as a synonym of his *maxillosa* from the E. Indies, has since been shown by Gerstaecker to be an African species quite distinct from *maxillosa*. Described from a male, it is probably identical with *Cissites testacea*, Fab.

Horia senegalensis, Casteln.—With regard to this species, I have come independently to the same conclusion as De Borre (1883), that it was made up of two distinct species, that the so-described male was in reality the female of a species belonging to the true *Cissites*, Latr., and that the female belonged to a species of *Horia* scarcely, if at all, distinguish-

able from the Indian species known as *testacea*, Fab.,—that it was, if I may so put it, *testacea*, Fab. (*Lymexylon*), on the male side and *testacea*, Fab. (*Horia*), on the female side.

Cissites macrognatha, Fairm. (*Horia*), from West Africa, is probably also identical with *testacea*, Fab. It was described from a male, but the author evidently assumed that the so-called male of *senegalensis*, Casteln., with the characters of which he compared it, was actually a male.

Four other African species referable to the genus *Cissites* have been described, and it is possible that one or more of these will turn out to be the same as *testacea*, Fab. In the British Museum collection there are specimens from Cape Colony that I cannot distinguish specifically from *testacea*. They do not, however, agree exactly with the description of *hottentota* given by Peringuey. I suspect, nevertheless, that Peringuey's species is the same.

As I have seen no specimens of *Cissites* from East Africa, I can express no opinion as to the validity of Kolbe's species *fischeri*. Gerstaecker considered a female specimen from East Africa to belong to the species *cephalotes*, Oliv.

Only two species of *Cissites* from the Oriental Region have been described—one the *maxillosa* of Fab., the other *anguliceps*, Fairm.; and I strongly suspect that the second was founded upon the female of the first.

The African and Oriental species of *Cissites* possess in common two characters of considerable importance which distinguish them from the American species, and I propose therefore to place them in a distinct subgenus, to which the name *Synhoria*, Kolbe, may be applied. The distinguishing characters are as follows:—

Eyes smooth and very glossy. The episterna of the mesothorax do not meet in front of the mesosternum or meet only at a point.	<i>Cissites.</i>
Eyes coarsely granulated and dull. The episterna of the mesothorax meet in the middle line and form a suture of some length in front of the mesosternum	<i>Synhoria.</i>

Genus HORIA.

Horia, Fab. Mant. Ins. i. p. 164 (1787); Latr. Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat. xxiv. p. 154 (1804); id. Hist. Nat. Crust. et Ins. x. p. 364 (1804); Oliv. et Latr. Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat. n. édit. xv. p. 291 (1817); Kolbe, Deut. Ost-Afrika, iv. Coleopt. p. 256 (1897); Champion, Suppl. List Cantharidæ. Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1899, p. 156.

Cissites, Latr. Gen. Crust. et Ins. ii. p. 211 (1807); id. Cuvier, Règne Anim. n. édit. v. p. 60 (1829); Casteln. Hist. Nat. ii. p. 280 (1840); Lacord. Gen. Coléopt. v. p. 663 (1859); Gemm. et Har. Cat. p. 2130 (1870); Beaugard, Les Insectes Vésicants, pp. 416 & 486 (1890).

Type of the genus, *Horia testacea*, Fab., 1787 (nec *Lymexylon testaceum*, Fab., 1781).

1. *H. africana*, Auriv. (*Cissites*) Ent. Tidskr. xi. p. 203 (1890). Congo.

? = *senegalensis*, ♀ (nec ♂), Casteln. Hist. Nat. ii. p. 280 (1840).

? = *testacea* (Fab.), De Borre, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1883, C. R. pp. 136-138.

2. *H. debyi*, Fairm. (*Cissites*) Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. xxix. C. R. p. 111 (1885). "Sumatra," Java, Borneo, India, Ceylon, and Philippine Islands.

= *testacea* (Fab.), Auriv. *l. c. supra*.

3. *H. testacea*, Fab. Mant. Ins. i. p. 164 (1787).

"Tranquebar."

Genus CISSITES.

Cissites, Latr. Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat. xxiv. p. 154 (1804); id. Hist. Nat. Crust. et Ins. x. p. 364 (1804); id. Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat. nouvelle éd. xv. p. 291 (1817).

Horia, Latr. Gen. Crust. et Ins. ii. p. 211 (1807); id. Cuvier, Règne Anim. nouv. éd. v. p. 60 (1829); Casteln. Hist. Nat. ii. p. 280 (1840); Lacord. Gen. Coléopt. v. p. 663 (1859); Gemm. & Har. Cat. p. 2130 (1870); Beauregard, Les Insectes Vésicants, pp. 414 & 485 (1890).

Synhoria, Kolbe, Deutsch Ost-Afrika, iv. Coleopt. p. 256 (1897); Champion, Supplemental List Cantharidæ, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1899, p. 156.

Type of the genus, *C. maculata*, Swederus (*Cucujus*).

American Species (subgen. *Cissites* proper).

1. *C. apicalis*, Perty (*Horia*), Del. Anim. p. 66, pl. xiii. fig. 14 (1830). Brazil.

2. *C. auriculata*, Champ. (*Horia*) Biol. Centr.-Amer., Col. iv. 2, p. 372, pl. xvii. fig. 9. Central and North America.

3. *C. maculata*, Swed. (*Cucujus*) Vetensk. Ac. Nya Handl. 1787, p. 199, pl. viii. fig. 8; Fabr. (*Horia*) Ent. Syst. i. 2, p. 90 (1792); Oliv. (*Horia*) Entom. iii. no. 53 bis, p. 4, pl. i. fig. 1 (1795). Central and South America and Antilles.

? Var. *apicalis*, Perty, *l. c. supra*.

African and Oriental Species (subgen. *Synhoria*).

African Species.

4. *C. cephalogona*, Fairm. (*Horia*) Notes Leyd. Mus. x.
p. 269 (1888). Congo.
5. *C. cephalotes*, Oliv. (*Horia*) Ent. iii. no. 53 bis, p. 5, pl. i.
fig. 3 (1795); Gerst. (*Horia*), Decken's Reisen in
Ost-Afrika, iv. 2, p. 205 (1873). Africa.
6. *C. crouzeti*, Fairm. (*Horia*) Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1894,
p. 329. Abyssinia.
7. *C. fischeri*, Kolbe (*Synhoria*), Deut. Ost-Afrika, iv. Col.
p. 256 (1897). Victoria Nyanza.
8. *C. hottentota*, Pering. (*Horia*) Trans. S. Afric. Phil. Soc.
iv. p. 134. South Africa.
9. *C. macrognatha*, Fairm. (*Horia*) Notes Leyd. Mus. ix.
p. 193 (1887). West Africa.
10. *C. senegalensis*, ♂ (nec ♀), Casteln. (*Horia*) Hist. Nat.
ii. p. 280 (1840). West Africa.
11. *C. testacea*, Fab. (*Lymecylon*) Sp. Ins. i. p. 256 (1781).
Africa.

? = *cephalotes*, Oliv. *l. c. supra*.

? = *senegalensis*, ♂, Casteln. *l. c. supra*.

? = *macrognatha*, Fairm. *l. c. supra*.

? = *hottentota*, Pering. *l. c. supra*.

Oriental Species.

12. *C. anguliceps*, Fairm. (*Horia*) Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. xxix.
C. R. p. 111 (1885). Sumatra or Borneo.
13. *C. maxillosa*, Fab. (*Horia*) Syst. Eleuth. ii. p. 86 (1801).
"Sumatra," Java, Borneo, Malay Penin., Burma,
Siam, and Philippine Islands.

? = *anguliceps*, Fairm. *l. c. supra*.